



Meeting Date: October 21, 2015 1:15 pm - 3:00 pm

Subject: Meeting Notes for NEPA/404 Merger Team Concurrence Point 4C

TIP Project B-4929 (Topsail Island Bridge Replacement)

Location: NCDOT Structure Design Conference Room, Century Center

Attendees: Merger Team (MT)

Present:

Brad Shaver, USACE Ron Lucas, FHWA Gary Jordan USFWS

Cathy Brittingham, NCDCM-Raleigh Mason Herndon, NCDWR

Via Conference Call:

Cynthia Van Der Wiele, USEPA

Stephen Lane, NCDCM Travis Wilson, NCWRC Gregg Bodnar, NCDCM

Present from RS&H Consultant Team:

Richard Bollinger, RS&H Jennifer Farino, RS&H Sean Kortovich, RS&H Will Weathersbee, RS&H Project Team (PT)

Present from NCDOT:
Tyler Stanton, NES

Mark Staley, Roadside Environmental

Craig Deal, Hydraulics Andy McDaniel, Hydraulics Brian Lipscomb, Hydraulics Craig Freeman, Hydraulics

Abby Vogt, Roadway Design

Via Conference Call: Stoney Mathis, Division 3

A NEPA/404 Merger Team meeting for the subject project was held on October 21st, 2015 in NCDOT's Structure Design Conference Room. The purpose of this meeting was to reach agreement on Concurrence Point (CP) 4C (Permit Drawings Review).

Introductions: Mr. Richard Bollinger opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Attendees introduced themselves.

Presentation: Mr. Bollinger presented a PDF of the permit plans, and discussion included the following:

General Project Description and Overview of Permit Plans

- Each wetland impact site was discussed one by one from Site 1 to Site 7.
- It was noted that there was only 0.06 acres of CAMA wetland impacts, less than Green Sheets commitment.
- Not all the water off the bridge is going to be able to be treated, so deck drains were added to the bridge. Brief summaries will be added to the SMP narrative concerning the dispersed direct discharges from the deck drains.
- Sites 2, 5, 6 and 7 have CAMA wetland impacts.
- Site 6 will have minimal impacts to the existing seawall.

November 24, 2015 Page 1 of 3

- Bents 4, 5 and 19-25 have been raised to 4.45' which is approximately 5' above the existing wetlands and therefore would not be considered an impact.
- The Bridge Survey Report (BSR) has been updated to include an additional bent in order to maintain access to the boat access navigational channel.
- Water ponding issue at Mr. Hendy's property was discussed and was determined that a yard inlet could be put in place to help treat water in this area before it outlets into the wetland area beyond the seawall. This would add only approximately 0.1 cfs to outfall from the current basin overflow pipe. It was requested to have a grass swale treat the water before it enters the drainage system.

Merger Team (MT) questions and comments were discussed as follows:

MT Comment: Total impacts should be listed in the impact chart and have the breakdown of CAMA wetlands below.

PT Response: Noted. Summary of impacts will be updated.

MT Comment: The cross sections typically show the fill slope, please show fill slopes where applicable. **PT Response**: Noted, fill slope labels will be added to the plans.

MT Comment: Add to notes that the proposed structure will miss the Sub-Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) habitat.

PT Response: Noted, a note will be added to the plans.

MT Comment: Add note to the total impacts chart about any pile impacts.

PT Response: Noted.

MT Comment: The work bridge will be considered a temporary impact and will have to be monitored throughout the life of the project and check green sheet commitments. Please modify the work bridge to miss the SAV habitat.

PT Response: Noted. The work bridge will be updated to avoid the SAV area.

MT Question: Are the footings going to have an impact? These are typically considered a permanent impact, but do not require mitigation.

PT Response: No mechanized clearing will occur at the footings and piles and therefore will not be considered as an impact. However, pile impacts will be counted in the total impacts and noted at the bottom of the summary sheet.

MT Comment: Please label all CAMA wetlands in the permit drawings.

PT Response: Noted, a label will be added to the CAMA wetlands.

MT Question: Can updated permit drawings be included with the meeting minutes?

PT Response: Updated permit drawings will be posted on the 4B-4C package website.

MT Question: On sheet 11 of 21, since the work bridge is only 2' above the Mean High Water (MHW) does this block access to the many piers south of this channel? If so, is there another way around to obtain access?

PT Response: A field review will take place during the field visit for the Navigation Evaluation Report (NER). Upon post meeting field review and further investigation, we find the 12' Minimum Vertical Clearance to the Temporary Work Bridge shown on the USCG Permit to be adequate to serve existing boat traffic in this area. The permit drawings have been modified to show the 12'

November 24, 2015 Page 2 of 3

minimum vertical clearance at the boat access channel. There is also an alternate route to access this area.

MT Question: When is this project being let?

PT Response: August 2016 (previously February 2017).

PT Question: Is there any way that work can be done during the Primary Nursery Area (PNA) moratorium from April 1st to September 30th? Using turbidity curtains or casings?

MT Response: Will need more information on the timeframes for construction. A list of items that would like to be done during the moratorium would be helpful. R-3601 has an example of this, but that project had a sturgeon habitat and this project does not. Stephen Lane will coordinate with the Fisheries Commission and get this process started.

PT Response: NCDOT will provide these items and a response to the agencies.

If any recipient of the meeting notes would like to add comments or feels a comment is erroneous or needs to be expanded, please feel free to contact Paul Atkinson at (919) 707-6707 or by email at patkinson@ncdot.gov.

Copies to:

Meeting Attendees

Attachments:

November 24, 2015 Page 3 of 3